

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

## PCT

To:

F.R. KELLY & CO  
Attn: Boyce, Conor  
27 Clyde Road  
Ballsbridge  
Dublin 4  
IRELAND

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND  
THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION

(PCT Rule 44.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>P71599PC00</b>	Date of mailing <i>(day/month/year)</i> <b>13/12/2004</b>
International application No <b>PCT/EP2004/010199</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraphs 1 and 4 below  International filing date <i>(day/month/year)</i> <b>13/09/2004</b>
Applicant  <b>FOTONATION VISION LIMITED</b>	

1. ☒ The applicant is hereby notified that the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority have been established and are transmitted herewith.

**Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:**

The applicant is entitled, if he so wishes, to amend the claims of the International Application (see Rule 46):

**When?** The time limit for filing such amendments is normally 2 months from the date of transmittal of the International Search Report; however, for more details, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

**Where?** Directly to the International Bureau of WIPO, 34 chemin des Colombettes  
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile No.: (41-22) 740.14.35

**For more detailed instructions,** see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

2. ☐ The applicant is hereby notified that no International search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.

3. ☐ **With regard to the protest** against payment of (an) additional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:

- ☐ the protest together with the decision thereon has been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the applicant's request to forward the texts of both the protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.

- ☐ no decision has been made yet on the protest; the applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.

**4. Reminders**

Shortly after the expiration of **18 months** from the priority date, the International application will be published by the International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or postpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international application, or of the priority claim, must reach the International Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication.

The applicant may submit comments on an informal basis on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the International Bureau. The International Bureau will send a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an international preliminary examination report has been or is to be established. These comments would also be made available to the public but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.

Within **19 months** from the priority date, but only in respect of some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone the entry into the national phase until **30 months** from the priority date (in some Offices even later); otherwise, the applicant must, **within 20 months** from the priority date, perform the prescribed acts for entry into the national phase before those designated Offices.

In respect of other designated Offices, the time limit of **30 months** (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19 months.

See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet site.

Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority



European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk

Authorized officer

**Shantisaroop Pherai**

## NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220

These Notes are intended to give the basic instructions concerning the filing of amendments under article 19. The Notes are based on the requirements of the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Regulations and the Administrative Instructions under that Treaty. In case of discrepancy between these Notes and those requirements, the latter are applicable. For more detailed information, see also the PCT Applicant's Guide, a publication of WIPO.

In these Notes, "Article", "Rule", and "Section" refer to the provisions of the PCT, the PCT Regulations and the PCT Administrative Instructions respectively.

### INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING AMENDMENTS UNDER ARTICLE 19

The applicant has, after having received the international search report, one opportunity to amend the claims of the international application. It should however be emphasized that, since all parts of the international application (claims, description and drawings) may be amended during the international preliminary examination procedure, there is usually no need to file amendments of the claims under Article 19 except where, e.g. the applicant wants the latter to be published for the purposes of provisional protection or has another reason for amending the claims before international publication. Furthermore, it should be emphasized that provisional protection is available in some States only.

#### What parts of the international application may be amended?

Under Article 19, only the claims may be amended.

During the international phase, the claims may also be amended (or further amended) under Article 34 before the International Preliminary Examining Authority. The description and drawings may only be amended under Article 34 before the International Examining Authority.

Upon entry into the national phase, all parts of the international application may be amended under Article 28 or, where applicable, Article 41.

#### When?

Within 2 months from the date of transmittal of the international search report or 16 months from the priority date, whichever time limit expires later. It should be noted, however, that the amendments will be considered as having been received on time if they are received by the International Bureau after the expiration of the applicable time limit but before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication (Rule 46.1).

#### Where not to file the amendments?

The amendments may only be filed with the International Bureau and not with the receiving Office or the International Searching Authority (Rule 46.2).

Where a demand for international preliminary examination has been/as filed, see below.

#### How?

Either by cancelling one or more entire claims, by adding one or more new claims or by amending the text of one or more of the claims as filed.

A replacement sheet must be submitted for each sheet of the claims which, on account of an amendment or amendments, differs from the sheet originally filed.

All the claims appearing on a replacement sheet must be numbered in Arabic numerals. Where a claim is cancelled, no renumbering of the other claims is required. In all cases where claims are renumbered, they must be renumbered consecutively (Administrative Instructions, Section 205(b)).

The amendments must be made in the language in which the international application is to be published.

#### What documents must/may accompany the amendments?

Letter (Section 205(b)):

The amendments must be submitted with a letter.

The letter will not be published with the international application and the amended claims. It should not be confused with the "Statement under Article 19(1)" (see below, under "Statement under Article 19(1)").

The letter must be in English or French, at the choice of the applicant. However, if the language of the international application is English, the letter must be in English; if the language of the international application is French, the letter must be in French.

## NOTES TO FORM PCT/ISA/220 (continued)

The letter must indicate the differences between the claims as filed and the claims as amended. It must, in particular, indicate, in connection with each claim appearing in the international application (it being understood that identical indications concerning several claims may be grouped), whether

- (i) the claim is unchanged;
- (ii) the claim is cancelled;
- (iii) the claim is new;
- (iv) the claim replaces one or more claims as filed;
- (v) the claim is the result of the division of a claim as filed

The following examples illustrate the manner in which amendments must be explained in the accompanying letter:

1. [Where originally there were 48 claims and after amendment of some claims there are 51]:  
"Claims 1 to 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37 to 48 replaced by amended claims bearing the same numbers; claims 30, 33 and 36 unchanged; new claims 49 to 51 added."
2. [Where originally there were 15 claims and after amendment of all claims there are 11]:  
"Claims 1 to 15 replaced by amended claims 1 to 11."
3. [Where originally there were 14 claims and the amendments consist in cancelling some claims and in adding new claims]:  
"Claims 1 to 6 and 14 unchanged; claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added." or  
"Claims 7 to 13 cancelled; new claims 15, 16 and 17 added; all other claims unchanged."
4. [Where various kinds of amendments are made]:  
"Claims 1-10 unchanged; claims 11 to 13, 18 and 19 cancelled; claims 14, 15 and 16 replaced by amended claim 14; claim 17 subdivided into amended claims 15, 16 and 17; new claims 20 and 21 added."

### "Statement under article 19(1)" (Rule 46.4)

The amendments may be accompanied by a statement explaining the amendments and indicating any impact that such amendments might have on the description and the drawings (which cannot be amended under Article 19(1)).

The statement will be published with the international application and the amended claims.

It must be in the language in which the international application is to be published.

It must be brief, not exceeding 500 words if in English or if translated into English.

It should not be confused with and does not replace the letter indicating the differences between the claims as filed and as amended. It must be filed on a separate sheet and must be identified as such by a heading, preferably by using the words "Statement under Article 19(1)".

It may not contain any disparaging comments on the international search report or the relevance of citations contained in that report. Reference to citations, relevant to a given claim, contained in the international search report may be made only in connection with an amendment of that claim.

### Consequence if a demand for international preliminary examination has already been filed

If, at the time of filing any amendments under Article 19, a demand for international preliminary examination has already been submitted, the applicant must preferably, at the same time of filing the amendments with the International Bureau, also file a copy of such amendments with the International Preliminary Examining Authority (see Rule 52.2(a), first sentence).

### Consequence with regard to translation of the international application for entry into the national phase

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that, where upon entry into the national phase, a translation of the claims as amended under Article 19 may have to be furnished to the designated/elected Office, instead of, or in addition to, the translation of the claims as filed.

For further details on the requirements of each designated/elected Office, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

## PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

## PCT

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>P71599PC00</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> see Form PCT/ISA/220 as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.	
International application No. <b>PCT/EP2004/010199</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>13/09/2004</b>	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year) <b>30/09/2003</b>
Applicant <b>FOTONATION VISION LIMITED</b>		

This International Search Report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This International Search Report consists of a total of 4 sheets.

☒ It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

## 1. Basis of the report

- a. With regard to the language, the international search was carried out on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ The international search was carried out on the basis of a translation of the international application furnished to this Authority (Rule 23.1(b)).

- b. ☐ With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, see Box No. I.

2. ☐ Certain claims were found unsearchable (See Box II).3. ☐ Unity of invention is lacking (see Box III).

## 4. With regard to the title,

☐ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☒ the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

**STATISTICAL SELF-CALIBRATING DETECTION AND REMOVAL OF BLEMISHES IN DIGITAL IMAGE**  
**S**

## 5. With regard to the abstract,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this International Search report, submit comments to this Authority.

## 6. With regards to the drawings,

- a. the figure of the drawings to be published with the abstract is Figure No. 3

☒ as suggested by the applicant.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because this figure better characterizes the invention.

- b. ☐ none of the figures is to be published with the abstract.

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No.  
PCT/EP2004/010199

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER  
IPC 7 H04N1/409 H04N5/217

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

## B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)  
IPC 7 H04N

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, PAJ, WPI Data, INSPEC, COMPENDEX

## C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No
X	US 2002/093577 A1 (ICHIKAWA CHIAKI ET AL) 18 July 2002 (2002-07-18)	1,2,4, 18-20,82
Y		3,5-17, 21-66, 68-81, 121-130
A	the whole document	67, 83-120
Y	US 6 035 072 A (READ ROBERT LEE) 7 March 2000 (2000-03-07)	5-17, 21-32, 34-39, 58-66, 121-130
	column 4, lines 35-58	
	----- -/--	

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

## \* Special categories of cited documents:

- \*A\* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- \*E\* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- \*L\* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- \*O\* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- \*P\* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

\*T\* later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

\*X\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

\*Y\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

\*S\* document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

Date of mailing of the international search report

2 December 2004

13/12/2004

Name and mailing address of the ISA  
European Patent Office, P.O. Box 5018 Patentstein 2  
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  
Tel: (+31-70) 340-2000 Telex: 655 0000

Authorized officer

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No  
PCT/EP2004/010199

## C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2000, no. 05, 14 September 2000 (2000-09-14) & JP 2000 050062 A (MINOLTA CO LTD), 18 February 2000 (2000-02-18) abstract & US 6 792 161 B1 (HASHIMOTO KEISUKE ET AL) 14 September 2004 (2004-09-14) column 9, line 46 - column 10, line 14; figure 11 -----	3, 33, 40-57, 68-81
A	US 2003/039402 A1 (ROBINS DAVID R ET AL) 27 February 2003 (2003-02-27) paragraphs '0057! - '0059! -----	1-130

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/EP2004/010199

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date		Patent family member(s)		Publication date
US 2002093577	A1	18-07-2002	JP	2002209147 A		26-07-2002
US 6035072	A	07-03-2000	NONE			
JP 2000050062	A	18-02-2000	US	6792161 B1		14-09-2004
US 6792161	B1	14-09-2004	JP	2000050062 A		18-02-2000
US 2003039402	A1	27-02-2003	WO	03019473 A1		06-03-2003

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/010199

International filing date (day/month/year)  
13.09.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
30.09.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
H04N1/409, H04N5/217

Applicant  
FOTONATION VISION LIMITED

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office - P.O. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas  
Tel. +31 70 320 2000 Fax +31 70 320 2001

Authorized Officer

Hardell, A





---

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/010199

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

- ☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- ☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-130
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	67,83-120
	No: Claims	1-66,68-82,121-130
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-130
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: US 2002/093577 A1 (ICHIKAWA CHIAKI ET AL) 18 July 2002 (2002-07-18)
- D2: US-A-6 035 072 (READ ROBERT LEE) 7 March 2000 (2000-03-07)
- D3: PATENT ABSTRACTS OF JAPAN vol. 2000, no. 05, 14 September 2000 (2000-09-14) & JP 2000 050062 A (MINOLTA CO LTD), 18 February 2000 (2000-02-18) & US-B1-6 792 161, 14 September 2004 (2004-09-14)

2. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1, 2, 4, 18-20 and 82 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.

2.1 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

- a method of automatically correcting dust artifact regions within images acquired by a digital acquisition device including an optical system (par. 2,6), comprising:
  - digitally-acquiring one or more original images with said digital acquisition device (par.30-32; fig.3 steps 32,33);
  - determining probabilities that certain pixels correspond to dust artifact regions within said one or more digitally-acquired images (par.33; fig.3 step 34);
  - associating the dust artifact regions with one or more extracted parameters relating to the optical system when the one or more images were acquired (par.33.; fig.3 step 35);
  - forming a statistical dust map including mapped dust regions based on the dust artifact probability determining and associating (par.35-36; fig.4);
  - correcting pixels corresponding to dust artifact regions ... based on the associated statistical dust map.

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from the disclosure of D1 in that the corrected pixels are pixels "within each of said one or more original images", whereas in D1 the corrected pixels are pixels of different images (fig.3 steps 38-42).

However, no technical effect is achieved and no problem is solved by this minor

modification. In both cases (D1 and present application) the dust map enables the dust correction of images taken with a particular setting of the optical system of the camera. It is therefore a pure matter of choice without the exercise of inventive skill to either use the dust map for the correction of a different image or the same image.

Claim 1 therefore does not involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

2.2 (Claims 2, 4) Dependent claims 2 and 4 relate to the choice of optical parameters, which have been disclosed by D1 (D1: par.34).

2.3 (Claims 18-20) Processing the image either inside the camera or outside in an external device is a matter of choice without inventive skill.

2.4 (Claim 82) Dust artifact data is sorted according to particular criteria (called meta-data in claim 82) in D1: fig.4.

3. Furthermore, dependent claims 3, 5-17, 21-66, 68-81 and 121-130 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

3.1 (Claims 5-17, 21-32, 34-39, 58-66, 121-130) Dependent claims 5-17, 21-32, 34-39, 58-66 and 121-130 relate to a particular way of determining the probability that a particular pixel is an image of a dust particle.

The problem addressed by these claims can therefore be regarded as how to decide whether a specific pixel under test represents an image of a dust particle or not. With this problem in mind the skilled person would consult document D2 which also deals with the problem of dust detection in imaging applications (D2: col.2 l.8-61).

D2 discloses in detail the subject-matter of the dependent claims mentioned above. It explicitly describes how the dust detection is performed on an arbitrary image which does not have to be a reference image (D2: col.2 l.88-11), the use of thresholds (D2: fig.6 step 640) and how the dust map is updated with further images (D2: col.4 l.37-58).

A skilled person would easily combine D1 with the dust detection algorithm of D2 in order to arrive at the subject-matter of the above-mentioned claims. Therefore, these claims do not involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

3.2 (Claims 3, 33, 40-57, 68-81) Further dependent claims 3, 33, 40-57 and 68-81 relate to a particular appearance of dust particle images and how to calculate certain optical parameters of the system after an analysis of the dust particle image.

The problem addressed by these claims can therefore be regarded as how to relate parameters of the optical system to the appearance of the dust particle image.

A similar problem has been solved by document D3 (reference is made to the US-document claiming a single priority from the JP-document, which is in time). D3 also addresses the problem of dust in optical imaging applications. D3 discloses the detection of positions (distance along optical axis) of a dust particle in an imaging system with a known optical system depending on the appearance of the dust particle image (D3: fig.11). A skilled person would without the exercise of inventive skill apply the teaching of D3 to the present problem and derive parameters of a variable optical system when the position of the dust particle (distance along optical axis) is known, depending on the appearance of the dust particle image.

The above-mentioned claims do therefore not involve an inventive step (Art. 33(3) PCT).

4. (Claims 67, 83-120) As far as dependent claims 67 and 83-120 can be understood, they relate to a specific way of recalculating existing dust maps generated with a particular setting of the optical system to correlate with other images taken with a different setting of the optical system. The advantage appears to be that any image taken with a new setting of the optical system can be dust-corrected using the recalculated, but existing dust map.

It appears that these details have not been disclosed in any of the cited documents and the combination of features of claims 67 or 83-120 with the features of claim 1 is therefore considered novel and inventive.